

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated August 24, 2007 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-18 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1–18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over published U.S. Patent Application, Publication No. 2004/0167845, by Corn et al. (hereinafter “Corn”) in view of published U.S. Patent Application, Publication No. 2004/0039685, by Hambrecht et al. (hereinafter “Hambrecht”).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of independent claim 1. Independent claim 1 is allowable in that it recites “A computerized system for trading products between at least one buyer and at least one seller, comprising ... buyer activity information for each buyer, comprising: information of a frequency with which said buyer has accessed said computerized system, information of a frequency with which buyer has viewed said product, and information of whether said buyer has viewed detailed information about said product.” Nothing in Corn or Hambrecht, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests at least these features of the claimed invention.

The Examiner cites Corn as teaching these features. Applicants respectfully disagree. In contrast, Corn teaches a system that “determines a minimum price per click of a term in an auction based internet search.” (§ 0006). Corn deals with “liquidity (e.g., number of bidders for a particular search term),” which includes “the number of bidders. the frequency of bid changes, historical trends of the changes, highest maximum bid ever, [and] the offline data regarding the economics of products or services to be offered through this search term.” (§ 0006). Nowhere does Corn teach or suggest “buyer activity information for each buyer, comprising: information of a frequency with which said buyer has accessed said computerized system, information of a frequency with which buyer has viewed said product, and information of whether said buyer has viewed detailed information about said product.” Further, Hambrecht fails to cure the deficiency of Corn to teach or suggest these features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants

respectfully submit that independent claim 1, and its dependent claims 2–14, are allowable over any combination of Corn and Hambrecht.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of independent claim 15. Independent claim 15 is allowable in that it recites “a bid likelihood indicator for the buyer based on the buyer’s likelihood of entering a bid on a product.” Nothing in Corn and Hambrecht, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention.

Corn does not teach this feature of the claimed invention. In contrast, Corn teaches “determining a minimum bid for a search term based upon bids for other search terms.” The teaching in Corn pertains to the search term being bid upon, not the user. As such, Corn does not teach this feature of the claimed invention.


Hambrecht fails to cure the deficiency of Corn to teach this feature of the claimed invention. Hambrecht teaches an auction system for selling shares to investors. (§ 0002). Each investor places bids. (§ 0003) Once bidding is closed, the system computes calculates a fair market clearing price, and “everyone who bids above the clearing price receives a full allocation.” (§ 0003). There is no teaching of computing “a bid likelihood indicator for the buyer based on the buyer’s likelihood of entering a bid on a product.” As such, Hambrecht fails to cure the deficiency of Corn to teach at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 15, and its dependent claims 16–18, are allowable over any combination of Corn and Hambrecht.

This application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: February 25, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Rebecca Goldman Rudich
Registration No.: 41,786
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorney for Applicant